

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER EDUCATION FOUNDATION

**717 H Street, Suite 317
Sacramento, CA 95814**

--ooOoo--

BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN MEETINGS

PUBLIC COMMENTS ONLY

FOR:

CHICO

Chico:

Mr. Anderson: And, we have a lot of members who have some strong, strong perceptions about what the BDCP will be doing. My name is Charles Anderson. I'm with the Association of the California Water Agencies. Written comments were provided yesterday by our president Glen Peterson in Sacramento and so this is (unintelligible) some oral comments that will be from (unintelligible). The Association of the California Water Agency represents more than 450 complete water agencies throughout the state, ranging from small irrigation districts to larger urban water agencies and aqua members collectively deliver 90 percent of the water in California to homes, businesses, farms and increasingly for the environment. Aqua members view the BDCP process as a critical step towards fixing the troubled delta and the larger goal of securing a more sustainable system for California. Briefly, I just have a few comments. The need for a more sustainable water system has never been more urgent. Species are in decline and communities are losing jobs and income because of a failing water system. The system we have today was conceived of in a different era, one that did not include consideration of the environment. We have to invest

in a sustainable delta and as part of that we need a comprehensive solution that includes the co-equal objectives of protecting the aquatic environment and providing for a reliable high quality drinking water that our economy needs. We also have to invest in the environmental restoration and fish passage improvements expand watering sufficiency and groundwater management, and increase of surface and ground water storage capacity. And, my final comment is that while the crisis in the delta is clearly a time urgent problem, we must insure that solutions there work for all of California. As solutions take shape, we have to make sure that we do not solve water supply problems south of the delta at the expense of upstream regions. Solutions must respect existing water rights in areas of origin interests. This is of particular interest to our members in the North Sac Valley and demands consideration. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, others?

Ms. Strong: My name is Susan Strong and thank you for coming to Chico. We do appreciate not having to drive to Sacramento. First of all I'd like to say that I think it's inappropriate to hold a scoping meeting for an environmental document when there is not a plan. I spent about two hours on the Web site for the conservation plan, and it was really

difficult to even determine exactly what is being considered. But, based on that research it looks as if there are two categories of potential impacts that would be of concern in our region. One is the conveyance issue. In doing conveyance improvements by installing the peripheral canal what sort of capacity changes will occur, and the ability to convey water if we increase the ability to convey water, where is that water gonna come from, and what would be the impacts of those changes? What would be the growth inducing impacts of those increases in water supply? If more state ground waters become a portion of this statewide water supply then either three increased conveyance capacity or as a substitute for un-devoted surface water, then we need to look at what would be the impacts on the ground water systems up here. Those will include impacts to public services because we have increased pumping costs, and deepening of loans. It would possibly include increased emissions if we have to pump more to draw ground water for agricultural, municipal and industrial supply. But, most important and for the fisherman's agencies, there is an aqua-form, formation called the lower Tuscan which surfaces along the eastern edge of the Sacramento Valley. And, that is crossed by five (unintelligible)

salmon streams. Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, Deer (unintelligible) and bridal creek, and that particular aqua first system right now has wells funded to extract 30 thousand acre feet of water between June 1, and October 1, and that was intended for the Sacramento (unintelligible) agreement. So, as a basis of comparison the city of Chico from June 1 to October 1(unintelligible) in '06 extracted about 18 (unintelligible) acre of water (unintelligible) water. We currently are experiencing about 10 feet of ground water to climb every 10 years. We've lost 20 feet since the middle 1980's. We have growing ground water depressions under the city of Chico and under Durham in 2006 they noticed for the first time. So this is a stressed community system, and if this ground water source which is going to affect spring run salmon streams is intended to be used as a substitute for service water that can no longer be devoted, that's really inputting impact. Finally the alternative analysis should look at whether regulation of water party impacts could be doing and not by disallowing surface diversions but, by managing of the toxic inputs at the source.

Chair: Thank you very much. Next?

Female: I just have a few brief questions and then to call the (unintelligible) Groundwater Protection Association and, I'm in the (unintelligible) predominately independently on groundwater.

Chair: I'm sorry if I didn't make myself clear before sort of Q & A, there's this comment.

Female: Oh.

Chair: So, we're just doing comments now, and if you have any questions.

Female: (Unintelligible)

Chair: Then, hopefully to some answers.

Female: Okay, great.

Chair: Okay.

Female: Thank you. One comment is I was under the impression that major projects had a real project alternative workup first. I haven't heard any comment about that. The reason why that comes to mind for me is because I read more and more about the exotic species in the delta, things like the mussel, they have no treatment that may help collapse into things that may, in and of themselves make certain (unintelligible) recovery goes, impact going along one, and the, that brings to mind what kind of risks are you going to impose in the source areas that might provide you alternative solutions for your

adaptive management projects, especially because we have unknowns up here with our aquifer, with our water supplies, with the potential direction of our economy up here and, you know, what kind of out sources we're going to need to respond to our future demands. How would you fund or (unintelligible) this project fund, the research that will be needed to assure us that more solutions aren't coming at the risk of our (unintelligible), thank you.

Ms. Vlamis: My name is Barbara Vlamis. I represent 850 members of Butte Environmental Council. I'm going to start out by saying I really object to your moving protocol. It's terribly unfortunate that you have interested parties here, and not only will you not answer questions for the group, you are telling people that they can't even ask questions (unintelligible). And, I think that's --

Chair: You know, I want to make that clear because I'm not saying don't ask questions, I just wanted to make sure that you knew that these folks are here to listen and if there are Q & A, we'll get into it later. So, I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't miss-representing it.

Ms. Vlamis: -- I think that with in here, and especially with a small audience we should be able to obtain answers, thank you that we can ask questions, that that's clear, but I think we should be able to ask

people questions in a group in here, and group answers, and I find that objectionable. I find no project description, and I don't know what, and I agree with Susan. There's nothing to scope. You know, you have nebulous, down the road HCP and NCCP. There is no project, so I don't know how you can proceed with Sequa and NEPA at this point. I think, you know, you have your priorities eschewed and I have never yet encountered an HCP and NCCP that started the environmental review before they've even got to the purpose and need, and what are you doing? And, there's no initial study provided, at least that's acknowledged that that isn't provided to the public which would have at least given us a little more, I hope to balance off of. And, I really think that if you ever get to a project description so that the public would want something to analyze and comment on, I hope you'll come back because I think this should all be repeated. Because, it's terribly pre-mature, but I would hope that as you look at creating a project description that you will consider the terrestrial and aquatic species and, habitat that is outside of your study area. Clearly the tributaries are crucial to what happens in the delta and so, I don't think that you can only consider a project area that was at least good to read that you may consider that. But, I

think you absolutely must consider it, and that's all for now. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

Ms. King Moon: I'm Laura King Moon with the State Water Contractors and I represent 27 agencies, water agencies up and down the state that byline from the state water project. And, I'd just like to observe that this year due to restrictions under the Endangered Species Act we've had to give up 600 thousand acre feet of water already, about a 20 percent (unintelligible) on our average water supply for the year. And that's just, you know, (unintelligible). As a result of that, and that those restrictions are in place because of the way the water is moved through the delta. And so, we're very much supporting this conservation plan which we hope will lead to a much more (unintelligible) water and a conservation plan that will address a lot of the other problems that are affecting those species so that we aren't doing the knob to turn in response to their problems. I think that land that this plan will do; it will put a lot less pressure on the water resources here in the north if we're able to move the water that's in the reservoirs and that won't be ratcheted down so severely as we are right now. So, I'm very happy to see, interested to hear

the comments that this is too soon from the (unintelligible), usually it seems to me that you want to (unintelligible) anyway so people will have a chance to provide input, and I certainly learned a lot from three of you tonight. So, I appreciate you coming up here and doing this, thank you.

Chair: Is there anyone else? It looks like we have another one.

Ms. Dunlap: I just have a quick comment. My name is Marty Dunlap and I just want to dovetail a little bit on, in the part of the project as it goes forward that it has to do with establishing a water reliability and the movement of water, you know, south. That the growth inducing impact creating environments or communities that are going to be dependent on this water is going to create a never dependent need. And I really want to make sure that that's taken into account because that available water might not always be possible, and then there's, we've created this expectancy that this is going to be moving down there and not necessarily gonna be feasible.

Chair: Okay, are there any others? Okay, so hearing that I think we'll adjourn this part of the meeting but please feel free to stay. We have plenty of time; go take a look at the stations again. All of the staff members will stay and answer your questions.

Female: (Unintelligible)

Chair: Okay, sure. Thank you all very much.

-- MEETING ADJOURNED --